

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Applicants : Thomas W. Hathaway

Serial No. : 10/636,128

Filed : August 7, 2003

For : A User Operable Help Information System

Examiner : Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit : 2179

APPEAL BRIEF

May It Please The Honorable Board:

Appellants initiate a new appeal under 37 CFR 41.27 in response to the Final Rejection, dated October 19, 2007, of claims 1-30 of the above-identified application. The fee of five hundred ten dollars (\$510.00) for filing this Brief is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2179. Enclosed is a single copy of this Brief.

Please charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Appellants do not request an oral hearing.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of Application Serial No. 10/636,128 is the Assignee of record:

Siemens Medical Solutions Health Services Corporation
51 Valley Stream Parkway
Malvern, PA 19355-1406

which merged into Siemens Medical Solutions USA Inc. on 1 January 2007.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are currently, and have been, no related Appeals or Interferences regarding Application Serial No. 10/636,128.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-30 are rejected and the rejection of claims 1-30 are appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments were entered and are reflected in the claims included in Appendix I.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page 2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). An interface processor receives (page 1, line 29-page 2, line 4) user entered data (page 13, lines 14-20; Figure 5, reference nos. 520 and 530) representing a help message conveying help information (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300) and a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of the help message (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). An identifier identifies a help information repository associated with the help message (page 8, lines 8-24; Figure 3). A user interface provides a display image

including a help message (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3; Figure 5, reference no. 550) and enables a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368). A data processor (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 8-16) stores the help message conveying help information in the help information repository in order of creation by using the creation time indicator (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 18-20; Figure 3, reference no. 320).

Dependent claim 2 includes all the features of independent claim 1, along with the additional feature the display image includes a link representative item enabling a user to retrieve the additional document (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) and enables a user to retrieve help message information from the help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) sorted by creation time using a creation time indicator (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). The interface processor includes a search operation (page 10, lines 6-14; Figure 3, reference no. 358). The search operation allows a user to search help information repository.

Dependent claim 3 includes all the features of independent claim 1, along with the additional feature the data processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) for retrieving the additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting the hyperlink in a help message (page 12, lines 11-23). The data processor automatically deletes the help message after expiration of a time period from a creation time (page 6, lines 14-16; Figure 4, reference no. 430).

Dependent claim 4 includes all the features of independent claim 1, along with the additional feature that the creation time indicator includes a creation date indicator (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). The data processor (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 8-16) stores the message conveying help information in the help information repository in order of creation by using the creation time and date indicator (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 18-20; Figure 3, reference no. 320).

Independent claim 12 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page

2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). An interface processor receives (page 1, line 29-page 2, line 4) user entered data (page 13, lines 14-20; Figure 5, reference nos. 520 and 530) representing a message conveying help information (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300). A creation time indicator identifies a creation time of the help message (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). An identifier identifies a help information repository associated with the help message (page 8, lines 8-24; Figure 3). A section indicator identifies a section of the help information repository associated with the help message and the interface processor initiates searching of the help information repository to identify help messages in response to user command (page 10, lines 6-14; Figure 3, reference no. 358). A user interface (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 8-16) provides a display image presenting identified help messages ranked according to creation time (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 18-20; Figure 3, reference no. 320) and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368). A user interface provides a display image presenting identified help messages (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3; Figure 5, reference no. 550) ranked according to creation time and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368). A data processor (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 8-16) stores the help message conveying help information in the help information repository in order of creation using the creation time indicator (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 18-20; Figure 3, reference no. 320).

Independent claim 15 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page 2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). A command processor receives a request (page 13, lines 14-20; Figure 5, reference nos. 520 and 530) to access help information (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300) and includes an indicator identifying a particular user interface display

image (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3; Figure 5, reference no. 550) employed by the at least one executable application and associated with the help information request. Help information is retrieved from a repository in response to the request (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368). A display generator (page 13, line 4) initiates display of at least one image in response to the request. The at least one image includes message conveying help information (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3; Figure 5, reference no. 550) in a time order of creation and is associated with the displayed user interface image employed by the executable application. A user is enabled to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368).

Dependent claim 18 includes all the features of independent claim 15, along with the additional feature the command processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) for retrieving the additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting the hyperlink in a help message (page 12, lines 11-23). The at least one image presents messages conveying help information in time order of creation with a most recently created message being presented first (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320).

Independent claim 20 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page 2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). A display generator (page 13, line 4) initiates display of at least one help access image in response to selection of a help icon (page 12, line 27-page 13, line 4) associated with a user interface image employed by the executable application. The help access image includes an image element enabling (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300) a user to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository (page 9, lines 17-19; Figure 3, reference no. 350), (b) access user manual information associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3), (c) read information derived from the help information repository including messages conveying help information (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem in a time order of creation (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320) and associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a

particular help message from a help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368). A command processor (page 13, lines 14-20; Figure 5, reference nos. 520 and 530) initiates access to the help information repository (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) in response to user activation of the image element.

Independent claim 21 provides a method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page 2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). User entered data (page 13, lines 14-20; Figure 5, reference nos. 520 and 530) representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem is received (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300). An indicator identifying a creation of time of the message is received (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). An identifier for identifying a help information repository associated with the message is received (page 8, lines 8-24; Figure 3). The help message conveying help information is stored in the help information repository in order of creation by using the indicator (page 2, lines 4-5; page 8, lines 18-20; Figure 3, reference no. 320).

Independent claim 22 provides a method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page 2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). A request to access help information (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem is received (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300). An indicator identifying a particular user interface display image (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3; Figure 5, reference no. 550) employed by the executable application is included and is associated with the request. Display of at least one image is initiated in response to the request. The at least one image includes messages conveying help information in a time order of creation (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320) and is associated with the user interface display image employed by the executable application. A user is enabled to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368).

Independent claim 23 provides a method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application (page 1, lines 28-29; page 2, lines 27-28; Figure 5, reference no. 510). Display is initiated (page 13, line 4) of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon (page 12, line 27- page 13, line 4) associated with a user interface image employed by the executable application. The help access image includes an image element enabling a user to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository (page 9, lines 17-19; Figure 3, reference no. 350), (b) access user manual information associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3); (c) read information derived from the help information repository including messages conveying help information (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem in a time order of creation and (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320) associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368). Access is initiated to the help information repository (page 5, lines 4-16; page 13, lines 20-25; page 14, lines 4-10) in response to user activation of the image element.

Independent claim 24 provides a method including the following activities. In response to a first single action (page 12, lines 6-9; Figure 4, reference no. 440), a help log included by a user-editable help application is presented (page 12, lines 20-22). The help log corresponds to an operation related to a computer application (page 2, lines 21-27). In response to a second single action (page 14, lines 24-27), a user-defined help message is provided to a database (page 12, lines 11-13). The user-defined help message includes information related to the operation and addresses a recorded problem encountered in using the computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300). The user-defined help message is rendered according to a creation time in the help log (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). A display image is provided including the help message and enables a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the database (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368).

Dependent claim 25 includes all the features of independent claim 24, along with the additional feature of displaying a link representative item in the help message enabling a user to retrieve the additional document (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) and enabling a user to retrieve help message information (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) from the database sorted by creation time (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). A confirmation of posting of the help message is provided (page 12, lines 7-9).

Dependent claim 26 includes all the features of independent claim 24, along with the additional feature of automatically parsing a help message and creating a link (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368) for retrieving the additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting the hyperlink in a help message (page 12, lines 11-23). A search function is provided (page 10, lines 6-14; Figure 3, reference no. 358).

Independent claim 28 provides a method including the following activities. Via a first single action (page 12, lines 6-9; Figure 4, reference no. 440), a help log included by a user-editable help application is accessed (page 12, lines 20-22). The help log corresponds to an operation related to a computer application (page 2, lines 21-27). Via a second action (page 14, lines 24-27), a user-defined message is provided to the user-editable help application. The user-defined help message includes information related to the operation and addresses a recorded problem encountered in using the computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem (page 7, lines 9-14; Figure 3, reference no. 300). The user-defined help message is displayed according to a creation time in the help log (page 8, lines 1-24; Figure 3, reference no. 320). A user is enabled to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the database (page 9, lines 6-15; page 10, lines 23-25; Figure 3, reference nos. 362, 368).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-30 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,990), hereinafter "Sullivan".

VII. ARGUMENT

Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features of the present claimed arrangement. Thus, reversal of the Final Rejection (hereinafter termed “rejection”) of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Reversal of the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sullivan (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,990) is respectfully requested because the rejection makes crucial errors in interpreting the cited references. The rejection erroneously states that claims 1-30 are anticipated by Sullivan.

Overview of the Cited References

Sullivan describes a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user’s self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user’s machine, all from the engineer’s desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract).

CLAIMS 1, 5-11, 13 and 14

Independent claim 1 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. An interface processor receives user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem and a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of the help message. An identifier identifies a help information repository associated with said help message. A user interface provides a display image including a help message and enables a user to retrieve an additional document associated

with a particular help message from the help information repository. A data processor stores the help message conveying help information in the help information repository in order of creation by using the creation time indicator. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "help messages" conveying "help information **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one

executable application ... an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites Figures 4 and 5 and the description on column 7, lines 55-67 and column 8, lines 1-18 of Sullivan as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed “interface processor”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “**user entered data representing a help message conveying help information** addressing a **recorded problem** encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan merely provides display of a problem notification identifying that a problem has occurred with a specific application. Nowhere does this disclose or suggest user-entered information for **addressing** a particular “**recorded problem** encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating** or **reducing** said problem” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Column 7, lines 55-67 describes (as seen in Figure 4) that:

“the user has tried, unsuccessfully, to launch a Microsoft Word application and, instead, he or she has received an error message (e.g., ‘wwint132.dll error’). The display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support ... The routine begins at step 60. At step 62, a test is run to determine whether the user requires automated technical support. If not, the routine cycles. If, however, the user has indicated his or her request for technical support ... the routine continues at step 64 to launch the client program code and its associated server interface” (column 7, line 57-column 8, line 3).

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant’s interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that “the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible ‘problem areas’ ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application” (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed “help information” that is user entered and received by the claimed “interface processor”. Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on

his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, although Sullivan may describe an interface processor, the interface processor of Sullivan does not disclose or suggest receiving “user entered data representing a **help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on page 3 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least

one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator “system for providing help information supporting **user** operation of at least one executable application” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem ... a user interface providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of said help message” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action cites Figure 19 and column 12, lines 15-20 and column 14, lines 20-25 in support of the assertion that Sullivan anticipates this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited sections of Sullivan are merely concerned with sending information to a server when live help is requested thereby placing a user in a queue for service (*see* column 12, lines 15-20) and also enabling a journaling function for the technical support representative to detail the service provided to the user (*see* column 14, lines 20-25). However, neither of these actions are equivalent to “receiving ... user entered data” for “conveying help information addressing a recorded problem” to a user as in the claimed arrangement. The use of a journal function for quality control as in Sullivan is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement because that information is for use by the system analyst and NOT the user. Moreover, element 160 in Figure 19 represents a time and date of which a **problem** was identified and entered into the Sullivan system to be resolved. This problem identification is **NOT** a help message because the problem identifier of Sullivan does not convey “help information addressing a recorded problem”. Rather, Figure 19 merely shows the time and date that the problem was reported. There is no mention of resolving the “problem” by “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “user interface providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 1. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling “a user to retrieve an additional document” that is associated with the help message and the application to which the help message pertains. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Column 11, lines 55-67, column 13, lines 44-67 and figure 17 of Sullivan cited by the Office Action on page 4 do not show or suggest these features. Column 11, lines 55-67 describes a self-help function. “[E]xisting Web information can easily be incorporated via links inside the

self-help templates. This includes any Web-based content, including multimedia how-to information, and other knowledge bases” (column 11, lines 56-60). Column 13, lines 44-67 describes a “Content Browser” display panel. “The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages” (column 13, lines 45-50). Therefore, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing **system analysts** to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... a user interface providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an **additional document** associated with a particular help message from said **help information repository**” as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action on the bottom of page 20 argues that the cited case law (specifically, *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216, USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968))) determines that “any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way”. The MPEP states that a “reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments,” (*Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 975 (1989)) and “The use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with

which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain.’ *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968))” (MPEP 2123, paragraph I). Thus, a reference can be relied upon for all it reasonably suggests to one having ordinary skill in the art, including nonpreferred embodiments and the reference is relevant for all it contains, as being part of the literature of the art. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan, nowhere in the cited columns, lines, figures or elsewhere anticipates the features of the present claimed arrangement, even when including nonpreferred embodiments or relied upon for all that would have been reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Additionally, as claims 5-11, 13 and 14 are dependent on independent claim 1, these claims are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5-11, 13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 2

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered patentable because Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests that the “display image includes a link representative item enabling a user to retrieve said additional document and enables a user to retrieve help message information from said help information repository sorted by creation time using a creation time indicator” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Sullivan provides no mechanism for allowing a **user** to obtain and access an additional document associated with a particular help message. Rather, the Sullivan system provides links to a plurality of different topics associated with a problem message and enables a user to perform “guided self help” to try to resolve the problem (*see* column 8, lines 39-67). The selection of documents perceived to be relevant by a user in Sullivan is fundamentally different from the claimed arrangement which receives a user entered help message that includes help information which addresses **a recorded problem encountered** when using an application and provides targeted information for eliminating or reducing said problem. The present claimed system further enables a user to obtain additional information via a

link within the help message. Although cited column 11, lines 55-67 describes that “existing Web information can easily be incorporated via links inside the self-help templates. This includes any Web-based content, including multimedia how-to information, and other knowledge bases,” (column 11, lines 56-60) the links DO NOT enable “a user to retrieve said additional document” or enable “a user to retrieve help message information from said help information repository sorted by creation time using a creation time indicator” as in the present claimed arrangement. Thus, the claimed system provides targeted application specific support. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 3

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered patentable because Sullivan fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of that the “data processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting said hyperlink in a help message” as in the present claimed arrangement. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest providing or receiving “user entered data representing a help message” in any manner. Thus, there is no hint or suggestion that the Sullivan system can parse help messages and create links to additional documentation based on the text of the particular help message.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23 of the Office Action, it is argued that “Sullivan expressly teaches taking a map diagnostic result message that can be delivered to a user and parsing the message to determine if the messages includes a map or a URL to a given page. The teachings of Sullivan state that Self Help Service String is used to populate the interface. The string is parsed to present the solution to the user (See column 11, lines 35-55)”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage specifically states that:

“[r]ather than forcing an end user to be detective and to enter a series of search strings while attempting to find a solution, the [system of Sullivan] ... captures the live context of the user’s running system and dynamically guides the user to the appropriate subset of relevant active content. Using ... diagnostic maps, the system performs an electronic diagnosis of the user’s system and facilitates further automated technical support ... In this manner, the automated technical support functionality electronically and automatically performs the start-to-finish

sequence of tasks in a support procedure that was previously performed manually and repetitively” (column 11, lines 33-54).

Thus, although Sullivan may automate a search process or may perform an electronic diagnosis of the user’s system to provided automated technical support, Sullivan does not **automatically** parse “a help message” and create “a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and” insert “said hyperlink in a help message” as recited in claim 3 of the present arrangement.

Additionally, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests that the “data processor automatically deletes said help messages after expiration of a time period from a creation time” as recited in claim 3. The Office Action cites column 14, lines 30-32 of Sullivan in support of the assertion that the claimed feature is anticipated. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited section of Sullivan fails to provide any enabling disclosure beyond the fact that journal entries may be deleted. Moreover, as discussed above, the journal entries of Sullivan are not equivalent to the present claimed help messages and, even if they were equivalent, there is nothing to suggest automatic deletion of these messages “after expiration of a time period from a creation time” as in the present claimed arrangement. In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23 of the Office Action, it is argued that “Sullivan also teaches the process of displaying dialog boxes to the user, which can be deleted after a period of time”. Applicant respectfully submits that the displayed “dialog boxes” in Sullivan may be provided to a user, however, Sullivan does not disclose or suggest that “said data processor automatically deletes said help message after expiration of a time period from a creation time” as recited in claim 3 of the present arrangement. Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests the features of claim 3 and does not anticipate claim 3. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 4

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered patentable because cited Figures 12 and 19 (and the corresponding description) of Sullivan fail to provide 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of the features claimed in claim 4. Specifically, Figures 12 and 19 neither disclose nor suggest that the “creation time indicator includes a creation date indicator and said data processor stores said messages conveying help information in said help information repository in order of creation by using said creation

time and date indicator” as recited in claim 4. Rather, Figures 12 and 19 of Sullivan merely show the listing and storage of a problem incident and neither disclose nor suggest storing “help messages” that include help information for addressing a recorded problem. Therefore, the Office Action is correct in the assertion on page 5 that the “incident” is organized by time and date. However, the incident listing in Sullivan is fundamentally different from a help message that is provided in response to a “problem encountered in using at least one executable application” as in the present claimed arrangement. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is not anticipated by Sullivan. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 12

Independent claim 12 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. An interface processor receives user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem. A creation time indicator identifies a creation time of the help message. An identifier identifies a help information repository associated with the help message. A section indicator identifies a section of the help information repository associated with the help message and the interface processor initiates searching of the help information repository to identify help messages in response to user command. A user interface provides a display image presenting identified help messages ranked according to creation time and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository. A user interface provides a display image presenting identified help messages ranked according to creation time and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository. A data processor stores the help message conveying help information in the help information repository in order of creation using the creation time indicator. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 12 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is

available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "help messages" conveying "help information **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem" as recited in claim 12 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites Figures 4 and 5 and the description on column 7, lines 55-67 and column 8, lines 1-18 of Sullivan as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed "interface processor". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of

Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “**user entered data representing a message conveying help information** addressing a **recorded problem** encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 12 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan merely provides display of a problem notification identifying that a problem has occurred with a specific application. Nowhere does this disclose or suggest user-entered information for **addressing** a particular “**recorded problem** encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating** or **reducing** said problem” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Column 7, lines 55-67 describes (as seen in Figure 4) that:

“the user has tried, unsuccessfully, to launch a Microsoft Word application and, instead, he or she has received an error message (e.g., ‘wwint132.dll error’). The display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support ... The routine begins at step 60. At step 62, a test is run to determine whether the user requires automated technical support. If not, the routine cycles. If, however, the user has indicated his or her request for technical support ... the routine continues at step 64 to launch the client program code and its associated server interface” (column 7, line 57-column 8, line 3).

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant’s interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that “the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible ‘problem areas’ ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application” (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed “help information” that is user entered and received by the claimed “interface processor”. Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, although Sullivan may describe an interface processor, the interface processor of Sullivan does not disclose or suggest receiving “user entered data representing a **message conveying help information** addressing a **recorded problem**

encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 12 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on page 8 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 12 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in

debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator “system for providing help information supporting **user** operation of at least one executable application” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem ... a user interface providing a display image presenting identified help messages ranked according to creation time and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 12 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of said help message” as recited in claim 12. The Office Action cites Figure 19 and column 12, lines 15-20 and column 14, lines 20-25 in support of the assertion that Sullivan anticipates this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited sections of Sullivan are merely concerned with sending information to a server when live help is requested thereby placing a user in a queue for service (*see* column 12, lines 15-20) and also enabling a

journaling function for the technical support representative to detail the service provided to the user (*see* column 14, lines 20-25). However, neither of these actions are equivalent to “receiving ... user entered data” for “conveying help information addressing a recorded problem” to a user as in the claimed arrangement. The use of a journal function for quality control as in Sullivan is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement because that information is for use by the system analyst and NOT the user. Moreover, element 160 in Figure 19 represents a time and date of which a **problem** was identified and entered into the Sullivan system to be resolved. This problem identification is **NOT** a help message because the problem identifier of Sullivan does not convey “help information addressing a recorded problem”. Rather, Figure 19 merely shows the time and date that the problem was reported. There is no mention of resolving the “problem” by “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “a user interface providing a display image presenting identified help messages ranked according to creation time and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 12. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling “a user to retrieve an additional document” that is associated with the help message and the application to which the help message pertains. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Column 13, lines 55-67, column 14, lines 1-47 and figures 18 and 19 of Sullivan cited by the Office Action on page 9 do not show or suggest these features. Column 13 describes a “Content Browser” display panel. “The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages” (column 13, lines 45-50). Column 14 is directed towards an active journal functionality, as discussed above. Figures 18 and 19 show the Message Center Panel of a system analyst’s desktop and how an active journal is used (by an analyst), respectively. Therefore, Sullivan

merely allows system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “a display image presenting identified help **messages ranked according to creation time** and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said **help information repository**” as recited in claim 12.

Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests “a section indicator identifying a section of said help information repository associated with said help messages and said interface processor initiates searching of said help information repository to identify help messages in response to user command” as recited in claim 12. Sullivan merely provides lists of potential problem areas and enables a user to initiate self-help based on lists of topics that may be related. Sullivan does not provide a “message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application”. Additionally, as no help messages are disclosed or suggested by Sullivan, there is no mechanism by which to search a help information repository to identify help messages that may be used in eliminating or reducing the problem encountered by a user.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 12 of the present arrangement. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 15-17 and 19

Independent claim 15 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. A command processor receives a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem and includes an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by the at least one executable application and associated with the help information request. Help information is retrieved from a repository in response to the request. A display generator initiates display of at least one image in response to the request. The at least one image includes message conveying help information in a time order of creation and is associated with the displayed user interface image employed by the executable application. A user is enabled to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 15 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "a request to access help information **addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that “the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered”. Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request” as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites column 10, lines 34-61 as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed “command processor for: receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem** and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request” as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan in the cited passage recites that:

“[t]he technical support system may interact with the user’s local machine to execute diagnostic maps using a ‘mini Web server’ process running on the client. Thus, for example, the execute map step 102, among others, may be implemented

in this manner. One preferred method for executing a map locally from the client browser begins by sending a special URL to the local mini Web server. The local process authenticates the user, breaks apart the URL to determine which map to run, checks to see if the map is present ... 'executes' the instructions of the map, collects the resulting XML, and then parses the XML looking for self-service tags to be used for further navigation purposes ... Summarizing, the dynamic search string is built up when the diagnostic map is initially run on the user's system. This string is then fed into the server's search engine, and more relevant search 'hits' may result (or, as in the above example, a self-help answer is found). Some of these hits may, in turn, cause other diagnostic maps to run and, in this manner, the user narrows in on the desired solution. Thus, the present arrangement provides the ability to run a diagnostic map from the client browser during the self-help session, thereby greatly enhancing the user's likelihood of quickly finding the necessary technical solution" (column 10, lines 34-61).

Therefore, Sullivan allows a technical support system to interact with a user's local machine to execute diagnostic maps. The diagnostic map helps in finding a technical solution. However, the diagnostic maps are directed towards technical analysts and do not provide or suggest "[a] system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request" as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement.

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant's interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that "the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible 'problem areas' ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application" (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed "help information" that is accessed by a user and received by the claimed "command processor". Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and

which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications.

The Office Action on page 10 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request” as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be

interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “a command processor for: receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request ... a display generator for initiating display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and associated with said displayed user interface image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “retrieving help information from a repository in response to said request ... enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and

associated with said displayed user interface image employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 15. The Office Action cites Figure 16 and column 13, lines 43-67 in support of the assertion that Sullivan anticipates this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited passage of Sullivan describes a “Content Browser” display panel.

“The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages ... The Message Center allows the system analyst to send active messages to the end user and view active messages sent by the end user. The Message Center thus displays what has been said by the user, and what has been said in response by the system analyst. As the dialog proceeds, the information is recorded”. (column 13, lines 45-67).

Therefore, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. Additionally, Figure 16 displays a diagnostic map. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... a command processor for: receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and associated with said help information request” or “a display generator for initiating display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and associated with said displayed user interface image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be

provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “said at least one image including **messages conveying help information in a time order** of creation and associated with said displayed user interface image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said **help information repository**” as recited in claim 15.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 15 of the present arrangement. Additionally, as claims 16, 17 and 19 are dependent on independent claim 15, these claims are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 15. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-17 and 19 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 18

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 15 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 15. Claim 18 is also considered patentable because Sullivan fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of that the “said command processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting said hyperlink in a help message” as in the present claimed arrangement. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest providing or “receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem” in any manner. Thus, there is no hint or suggestion that the Sullivan system can parse help messages and create links to additional documentation based on the text of the particular help message.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23 of the Office Action, it is argued that “Sullivan expressly teaches taking a map diagnostic result message that can be delivered to a user and parsing the message to determine if the messages includes a map or a URL to a given page. The teachings of Sullivan state that Self Help Service String is used to populate the interface. The string is parsed to present the solution to the user (See column 11, lines 35-55)”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage specifically states that:

“[r]ather than forcing an end user to be detective and to enter a series of search strings while attempting to find a solution, the [system of Sullivan] ... captures the live context of the user’s running system and dynamically guides the user to the

appropriate subset of relevant active content. Using ... diagnostic maps, the system performs an electronic diagnosis of the user's system and facilitates further automated technical support ... In this manner, the automated technical support functionality electronically and automatically performs the start-to-finish sequence of tasks in a support procedure that was previously performed manually and repetitively" (column 11, lines 33-54).

Thus, although Sullivan may automate a search process or may perform an electronic diagnosis of the user's system to provided automated technical support, Sullivan does not **automatically** parse "a help message" and create "a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and" insert "said hyperlink in a help message" as recited in claim 18 of the present arrangement.

Additionally, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests that the "at least one image presents messages conveying help information in time order of creation with a most recently created message being presented first" as recited in claim 18. The Office Action cites column 14, lines 15-46, column 10, lines 34-67 and column 13, lines 50-60 of Sullivan in support of the assertion that the claimed feature is anticipated. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited sections of Sullivan fail to provide any enabling disclosure beyond the fact that analysts can add entries to a journal and browse and add references to the journal. Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests the features of claim 3 and does not anticipate claim 3. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 20

Independent claim 20 provides a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. A display generator initiates display of at least one help access image in response to selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by the executable application. The help access image includes an image element enabling a user to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository, (b) access user manual information associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application, (c) read information derived from the help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem in a time order of creation and associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application, and(d) retrieve an additional document associated with a

particular help message from a help information repository. A command processor initiates access to the help information repository in response to user activation of the image element. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 20 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "messages conveying help information **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one

executable application ... a display generator for initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 20 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites Figures 4 and 5 and the description on column 7, lines 55-67 and column 8, lines 1-18 of Sullivan as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed arrangement. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “a display generator for initiating display of at least one help access image in response to **user selection** of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository, (b) access user manual information associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, (c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as recited in claim 20 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan merely provides display of a problem notification identifying that a problem has occurred with a specific application. Nowhere does this disclose or suggest user-entered information for **addressing** a particular “**recorded problem** encountered in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing** said problem in a **time order** of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Column 7, lines 55-67 describes (as seen in Figure 4) that:

“the user has tried, unsuccessfully, to launch a Microsoft Word application and, instead, he or she has received an error message (e.g., ‘wwint132.dll error’). The display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support ... The routine begins at step 60. At step 62, a test is run to determine whether the user requires automated technical support. If not, the routine cycles. If, however, the user has indicated his or her request for technical support ... the routine continues at step 64 to launch the client program code and its associated server interface” (column 7, line 57-column 8, line 3).

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant's interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that "the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible 'problem areas' ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application" (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed "initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application" or read information derived from the "help information repository " that is user entered and includes "messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application". Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, Sullivan does not disclose or suggest receiving "**conveying help information addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application" as recited in claim 20 of the present arrangement.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based "system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application" including links in messages. The Office Action on page 13 argues that "Sullivan shows the user can read entries in the journal in the time of creation and by date and Sullivan shows that the user can click on a given map that was run on the machine and access a given repository of information based on the map results highlighting the error (See figures 13 and 14). However, the active journal (as shown in Figures 13 and 14 of Sullivan) are used by ANALYSTS NOT users and do not contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e.,

analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... a display generator for initiating display of at least one help access image in response to **user selection** of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element **enabling a user** to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository, (b) access user manual information associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, (c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as recited in claim 20 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator “system for providing help information supporting **user** operation of at least one executable application” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “a display generator for initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of ... (c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a

particular help message from a help information repository; and a command processor for initiating access to said help information repository in response to user activation of said image element”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling a **user** to ... retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as recited in claim 20 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to ... retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a **time order** of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 20. Sullivan, contrary to the present claimed arrangement, is merely concerned with sending information to a server when live help is requested thereby placing a user in a queue for service (*see* column 12, lines 15-20) and also enabling a journaling function for the technical support representative to detail the service provided to the user (*see* column 14, lines 20-25). However, neither of these actions are equivalent to “enabling a **user** to ... read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application” as in the claimed arrangement. The use of a journal function for quality control as in Sullivan is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement because that information is for use by the system analyst and NOT the user. Moreover, element 160 in

Figure 19 represents a time and date of which a **problem** was identified and entered into the Sullivan system to be resolved. This problem identification is **NOT** a help message because the problem identifier of Sullivan does not convey “help information addressing a recorded problem”. Rather, Figure 19 merely shows the time and date that the problem was reported. This is wholly unlike the present claimed arrangement which conveys “help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application”. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” or “a command processor for initiating access to said help information repository in response to user activation of said image element” as recited in claim 20. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling a user to “retrieve an additional document” that is associated with the help message and the application to which the help message pertains. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Sullivan describes “existing Web information can easily be incorporated via links inside the self-help templates. This includes any Web-based content, including multimedia how-to information, and other knowledge bases” (column 11, lines 56-60). Sullivan also describes a “Content Browser” display panel. “The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages” (column 13, lines 45-50). Therefore, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... a display generator for initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” that is retrieved by a user, as recited in claim 20.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 20 of the present arrangement. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 21

Independent claim 21 provides a method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. User entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem is received. An indicator identifying a creation of time of the message is received. An identifier for identifying a help information repository associated with the message is received. The help message conveying help information is stored in the help information repository in order of creation by using the indicator. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 21 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream

summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "user entered data representing a message conveying help information **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... receiving: (a) user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem" as recited in claim 21 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites column 10, lines 34-61 as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed arrangement. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving "help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem** ... an identifier for identifying a help information repository associated with said message; providing a display image including a help

message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 21 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan in the cited passage recites that:

“[t]he technical support system may interact with the user’s local machine to execute diagnostic maps using a ‘mini Web server’ process running on the client. Thus, for example, the execute map step 102, among others, may be implemented in this manner. One preferred method for executing a map locally from the client browser begins by sending a special URL to the local mini Web server. The local process authenticates the user, breaks apart the URL to determine which map to run, checks to see if the map is present ... ‘executes’ the instructions of the map, collects the resulting XML, and then parses the XML looking for self-service tags to be used for further navigation purposes ... Summarizing, the dynamic search string is built up when the diagnostic map is initially run on the user’s system. This string is then fed into the server’s search engine, and more relevant search ‘hits’ may result (or, as in the above example, a self-help answer is found). Some of these hits may, in turn, cause other diagnostic maps to run and, in this manner, the user narrows in on the desired solution. Thus, the present arrangement provides the ability to run a diagnostic map from the client browser during the self-help session, thereby greatly enhancing the user’s likelihood of quickly finding the necessary technical solution” (column 10, lines 34-61).

Therefore, Sullivan allows a technical support system to interact with a user’s local machine to execute diagnostic maps. The diagnostic map helps in finding a technical solution. However, the diagnostic maps are directed towards technical analysts and do not provide or suggest “[a] method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application receiving: (a) user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 21 of the present arrangement.

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant’s interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that “the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible ‘problem areas’ ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application” (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed “help information” that is user entered. Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan

system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications.

The Office Action on pages 13-14 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... receiving: (a) user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 21 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-

41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “receiving: (a) user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem ... an indicator identifying a creation time of said message ... providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 21 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “an indicator identifying a creation time of said message” as recited in claim 21. Nowhere in cited column 14, lines 15-46; column 10, lines 34-67 or column 13, lines 50-60 of Sullivan is there mention or disclosure of this feature. Rather, the cited passages describe enabling a journaling function for the technical support representative to detail

the service provided to the user (*see* column 14, lines 20-25). However, these actions are not equivalent to “receiving: (a) user entered data” for “conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” or “an indicator identifying a creation time of said message” as in the claimed arrangement. The use of a journal function for quality control as in Sullivan is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement because that information is for use by the system analyst and **NOT** the user. Moreover, element 160 in Figure 19 represents a time and date of which a **problem** was identified and entered into the Sullivan system to be resolved. This problem identification is **NOT** a help message because the problem identifier of Sullivan does not convey “help information addressing a recorded problem”. Rather, Figure 19 merely shows the time and date that the problem was reported. There is no mention of resolving the “problem” by “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 21. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling “enabling a user to retrieve an additional document” that is associated with the help message and the application to which the help message pertains. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Column 11 and column 13 of Sullivan cited by the Office Action on page 14 do not show or suggest these features. Column 11 describes a diagnostic map that can be utilized by system analysts. Column 13 describes a “Content Browser” display panel. “The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages” (column 13, lines 45-50). Therefore, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “method for

providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... receiving: (a) user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “an indicator identifying a **creation time** of said message ... providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said **help information repository**” as recited in claim 21.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 21 of the present arrangement. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 22

Independent claim 22 provides a method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. A request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem is received. An indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by the executable application is included and is associated with the request. Display of at least one image is initiated in response to the request. The at least one image includes messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and is associated with the user interface display image employed by the executable application. A user is enabled to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 12 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "receiving a request to access help information addressing a **recorded problem encountered** in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem** and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request ... messages conveying help information in a **time order** of creation and associated with said user interface display image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one

executable application ... receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request” as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites column 10, lines 34-61 as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed “receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem** and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request” as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan in the cited passage recites that:

“[t]he technical support system may interact with the user’s local machine to execute diagnostic maps using a ‘mini Web server’ process running on the client. Thus, for example, the execute map step 102, among others, may be implemented in this manner. One preferred method for executing a map locally from the client browser begins by sending a special URL to the local mini Web server. The local process authenticates the user, breaks apart the URL to determine which map to run, checks to see if the map is present ... ‘executes’ the instructions of the map, collects the resulting XML, and then parses the XML looking for self-service tags to be used for further navigation purposes ... Summarizing, the dynamic search string is built up when the diagnostic map is initially run on the user’s system. This string is then fed into the server’s search engine, and more relevant search ‘hits’ may result (or, as in the above example, a self-help answer is found). Some of these hits may, in turn, cause other diagnostic maps to run and, in this manner, the user narrows in on the desired solution. Thus, the present arrangement provides the ability to run a diagnostic map from the client browser during the self-help session, thereby greatly enhancing the user’s likelihood of quickly finding the necessary technical solution” (column 10, lines 34-61).

Therefore, Sullivan allows a technical support system to interact with a user's local machine to execute diagnostic maps. The diagnostic map helps in finding a technical solution. However, the diagnostic maps are directed towards technical analysts and do not provide or suggest "[a] method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request" as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement.

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant's interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that "the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible 'problem areas' ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application" (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed "help information" that is user entered and retrieved in response to "receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application". Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, although Sullivan may describe an interface processor, the interface processor of Sullivan does not disclose or suggest receiving "initiating display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including **messages conveying help information** in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface display image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository" as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on page 15 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request” as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a

USER oriented application operator “method for providing help information supporting **user** operation of at least one executable application” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request ... initiating display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface display image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling **a user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling **a user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “messages conveying help information in a time order of creation” as recited in claim 22. Column 11 and column 13 of Sullivan cited by the Office Action on page 16 do not show or suggest these features. Column 11 describes a diagnostic map that can be utilized by system analysts. Column 13 describes a “Content Browser” display panel. “The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the

incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages” (column 13, lines 45-50). Therefore, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request ... messages conveying help information in a time order of creation”.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “retrieving help information from a repository in response to said request ... initiating display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface display image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 22. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling a “user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” that is associated with the help message and the application to which the help message pertains. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Contrary to the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and does NOT initiate “display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface display image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 22.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 22, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 22 of the present arrangement. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 23

Independent claim 23 provides a method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. Display is initiated of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by the executable application. The help access image includes an image element enabling a user to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository, (b) access user manual information associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application; (c) read information derived from the help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using the executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem in a time order of creation and associated with the user interface image employed by the executable application, and(d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository. Access is initiated to the help information repository in response to user activation of the image element. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 23 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that conveys "help information **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem** in a time order of creation". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application" as recited in claim 23 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites column 10, lines 34-61 as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed “initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository, (b) access user manual information associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, (c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “help access image including an image element enabling a user to ... read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem** in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 23 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan in the cited passage recites that:

“[t]he technical support system may interact with the user’s local machine to execute diagnostic maps using a ‘mini Web server’ process running on the client. Thus, for example, the execute map step 102, among others, may be implemented in this manner. One preferred method for executing a map locally from the client browser begins by sending a special URL to the local mini Web server. The local process authenticates the user, breaks apart the URL to determine which map to run, checks to see if the map is present ... ‘executes’ the instructions of the map, collects the resulting XML, and then parses the XML looking for self-service tags to be used for further navigation purposes ... Summarizing, the dynamic search string is built up when the diagnostic map is initially run on the user’s system. This string is then fed into the server’s search engine, and more relevant search ‘hits’ may result (or, as in the above example, a self-help answer is found). Some of these hits may, in turn, cause other diagnostic maps to run and, in this manner, the user narrows in on the desired solution. Thus, the present arrangement provides the ability to run a diagnostic map from the client browser during the self-help session, thereby greatly enhancing the user’s likelihood of quickly finding the necessary technical solution” (column 10, lines 34-61).

Therefore, Sullivan allows a technical support system to interact with a user's local machine to execute diagnostic maps. The diagnostic map helps in finding a technical solution. However, the diagnostic maps are directed towards technical analysts and do not provide or suggest "[a] method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of ... read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application" as recited in claim 23 of the present arrangement.

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant's interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that "the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible 'problem areas' ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application" (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed "messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application". Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, although Sullivan may describe an interface processor, the interface processor of Sullivan does not disclose or suggest "read information **derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image

employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 23 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on pages 16 and 17 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities ... initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 23 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs

(e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator “method for providing help information supporting **user** operation of at least one executable application” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element **enabling a user** to at least one of: (a) add a message to a help information repository, (b) access user manual information associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, (c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “said help access image including an image element enabling a user to ... retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as recited in claim 23 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to ... retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said

executable application” as recited in claim 23. Sullivan describes the use of a journal function for quality control. However, Sullivan is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement because that information is for use by the system analyst and **NOT** the user. Moreover, element 160 in Figure 19 represents a time and date of which a **problem** was identified and entered into the Sullivan system to be resolved. This problem identification is **NOT** a help message because the problem identifier of Sullivan does not convey “help information addressing a recorded problem”. Rather, Figure 19 merely shows the time and date that the problem was reported. There is no mention of resolving the “problem” by “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application” as recited in claim 23. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling a user to “retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository”. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Column 14, cited in the Office Action, is directed towards an active journal functionality, as discussed above. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of ... (c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said

executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and (d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository” as recited in claim 23.

CLAIMS 24 and 27

Independent claim 24 provides a method including the following activities. In response to a first single action, a help log included by a user-editable help application is presented. The help log corresponds to an operation related to a computer application. In response to a second single action, a user-defined help message is provided to a database. The user-defined help message includes information related to the operation and addresses a recorded problem encountered in using the computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem. The user-defined help message is rendered according to a creation time in the help log. A display image is provided including the help message and enables a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the database. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 12 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is

provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "a user-defined help message" including "information related to the operation and **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using said computer application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests a "in response to a first single action, presenting a help log comprised by a user-editable help application, the help log corresponding to an operation related to a computer application; in response to a second single action, providing a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem" as recited in claim 24 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites Figures 4 and 5 and the description on column 7, lines 55-67 and column 8, lines 1-18 of Sullivan as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed

“providing a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” in response to a second single action. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving “user-defined help message ... addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**” as recited in claim 24 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan merely provides display of a problem notification identifying that a problem has occurred with a specific application. Nowhere does this disclose or suggest user-entered information for **addressing** a particular “**recorded problem** encountered in using said computer application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Column 7, lines 55-67 describes (as seen in Figure 4) that:

“the user has tried, unsuccessfully, to launch a Microsoft Word application and, instead, he or she has received an error message (e.g., ‘wwint132.dll error’). The display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support ... The routine begins at step 60. At step 62, a test is run to determine whether the user requires automated technical support. If not, the routine cycles. If, however, the user has indicated his or her request for technical support ... the routine continues at step 64 to launch the client program code and its associated server interface” (column 7, line 57-column 8, line 3).

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant’s interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that “the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible ‘problem areas’ ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application” (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed “user-defined help message” that is user entered. Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, although Sullivan may

describe an interface processor, the interface processor of Sullivan does not disclose or suggest receiving “providing a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and **addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 24 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on pages 17 and 18 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based “in response to a second single action, providing a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based method that provides “a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 24 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support

engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator for “a user-defined help message” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “providing a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database” as recited in claim 24 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “rendering the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log” as recited in claim 24. Column 14, cited by the Office Action on page 18, is directed towards an active journal functionality, as discussed above. Therefore, Sullivan merely allows system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a “providing a user-defined help message to a database, the **user-defined** help message comprising

information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem ... rendering the **user-defined** help message according to a creation time in the help log”.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23, it is argued that “Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)”. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT “rendering the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log; and providing a display image including said help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database” as recited in claim 24.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 24 of the present arrangement. Additionally, as claim 27 is dependent on independent claim 24, claim 27 claims is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 24. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24 and 27 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 25

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 24 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 24. Claim 25 is also considered patentable because Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests “displaying a link representative item in said help message enabling a user to retrieve said additional document and enabling a user to retrieve help message information from said database sorted by creation time” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. As discussed above with respect to claim 24, Sullivan provides no mechanism for allowing a **user** to obtain and access an additional document associated with a particular help message. Rather, the Sullivan system provides links to a plurality of different topics associated with a problem message and enables a user to perform “guided self help” to try to resolve the problem (*see* column 8, lines 39-67). The selection of documents perceived to be relevant by a user in Sullivan is

fundamentally different from the claimed arrangement which receives a user entered help message that includes help information which addresses **a recorded problem encountered** when using an application and provides targeted information for eliminating or reducing said problem. The present claimed system further enables a user to obtain additional information via a link within the help message. Although cited column 11, lines 55-67 describes that “existing Web information can easily be incorporated via links inside the self-help templates. This includes any Web-based content, including multimedia how-to information, and other knowledge bases,” (column 11, lines 56-60) the links DO NOT enable “a user to retrieve said additional document” or enable “a user to retrieve help message information from said database sorted by creation time” as in the present claimed arrangement. Thus, the claimed system provides targeted application specific support. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is respectfully requested.

CLAIM 26

Claim 26 is dependent on claim 24 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 24. Claim 26 is also considered patentable because Sullivan fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of that the “automatically parsing a help message and creating a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting said hyperlink in a help message” as in the present claimed arrangement. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest “providing a user-defined help message to a database ... comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application” in any manner. Thus, there is no hint or suggestion that the Sullivan system can parse help messages and create links to additional documentation based on the text of the particular help message.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 23 of the Office Action, it is argued that “Sullivan expressly teaches taking a map diagnostic result message that can be delivered to a user and parsing the message to determine if the messages includes a map or a URL to a given page. The teachings of Sullivan state that Self Help Service String is used to populate the interface. The string is parsed to present the solution to the user (See column 11, lines 35-55)”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passage specifically states that:

“[r]ather than forcing an end user to be detective and to enter a series of search strings while attempting to find a solution, the [system of Sullivan] ... captures the live context of the user’s running system and dynamically guides the user to the appropriate subset of relevant active content. Using ... diagnostic maps, the system performs an electronic diagnosis of the user’s system and facilitates further automated technical support ... In this manner, the automated technical support functionality electronically and automatically performs the start-to-finish sequence of tasks in a support procedure that was previously performed manually and repetitively” (column 11, lines 33-54).

Thus, although Sullivan may automate a search process or may perform an electronic diagnosis of the user’s system to provided automated technical support, Sullivan does not **automatically** parse “a help message” and create “a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and” insert “said hyperlink in a help message” as recited in claim 26 of the present arrangement. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 28-30

Independent claim 28 provides a method including the following activities. Via a first single action, a help log included by a user-editable help application is accessed. The help log corresponds to an operation related to a computer application. Via a second action, a user-defined message is provided to the user-editable help application. The user-defined help message includes information related to the operation and addresses a recorded problem encountered in using the computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem. The user-defined help message is displayed according to a creation time in the help log. A user is enabled to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from the database. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in claim 28 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed arrangement.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then

repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (*see* Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed arrangement, Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "a user-defined help message" that includes "information related to the operation and **addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using said computer application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 21 of the Office Action, it is argued that "the examples in Sullivan show the processor of a user having issues with Microsoft [W]ord where the application will not restart [and] that can be interpreted as an actual error. Further, the map diagnostic system that runs on the operating system can deliver results that are related to a specific problem that has occurred. Finally, the analyst can run a specific map based on the issues indicated in the knowledge base, send the map to the user, who can click the link and the results are delivered back to the analyst with the system determining from the map results the actual problem encountered". Although Sullivan may describe diagnostic maps, these maps are executed and analyzed by analysts (or technical support staff). Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests "providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem" as recited in claim 28 of the present arrangement.

The Rejection cites Figures 4 and 5 and the description on column 7, lines 55-67 and column 8, lines 1-18 of Sullivan as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed "providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest receiving "**user-**

defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 28 of the present arrangement. Rather, Sullivan merely provides display of a problem notification identifying that a problem has occurred with a specific application. Nowhere does this disclose or suggest user-entered information for **addressing** a particular “**recorded problem encountered** in using said computer application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing** said problem” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Column 7, lines 55-67 describes (as seen in Figure 4) that:

“the user has tried, unsuccessfully, to launch a Microsoft Word application and, instead, he or she has received an error message (e.g., ‘wwint132.dll error’). The display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support ... The routine begins at step 60. At step 62, a test is run to determine whether the user requires automated technical support. If not, the routine cycles. If, however, the user has indicated his or her request for technical support ... the routine continues at step 64 to launch the client program code and its associated server interface” (column 7, line 57-column 8, line 3).

Furthermore, column 8, lines 5-17 supports the Applicant’s interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides that “the interface processor preferably includes a listbox that includes a list of possible ‘problem areas’ ... In the illustrative example, the user is having difficulty starting a Microsoft Word application” (column 8, lines 6-17). This is NOT equivalent to the claimed “a user-defined help message” that is provided “to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem”. Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on his/her own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides an online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications. Therefore, although Sullivan may describe an interface processor, the interface processor of Sullivan does not disclose or

suggest receiving “providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and **addressing a recorded problem** encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 28 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on page 19 argues that “Sullivan shows the user selecting and entering a help message that is sent to a server where a list of probable issues are returned ... Sullivan teaches a diagnostic map that is activated by the user selecting a link within the content and the diagnostic checks the operating system and application for errors by running a set of scripts. The map performs a diagnostic on the computer and responds with the error message to the user (See column 10, lines 34-61). The message is also sent to a system analyst who can see the actual steps performed by the user. The analyst can then see the results, rerun the map routines, and then send a message to the user regarding a fix to the problem. The map routine and error messages are related to the user operation of an executable application and the messages are sent regarding the actual error that has occurred”. Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a USER based method for “providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application” including links in messages. Sullivan in Figures 3 and 19 shows an “Active Journal” that “is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for newly-reported incidents” (column 4, lines 1-4). However, the active journal used by ANALYSTS does NOT contain links, such as in the present claimed system (*see* Figure 3, reference no. 368 of the present application). Furthermore, the Sullivan system is for technical personnel (i.e., analysts) as admitted by Sullivan and the Office Action. The telemetry data in Sullivan is derived by diagnostic maps and “client side code” (*see* column 12, lines 19-23). This is wholly unlike the USER based method for “providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 28 of the present arrangement. Sullivan may describe “[d]iagnostic maps [that] are programmable, reusable objects that allow technical support engineers (SEs) ... to write custom tools for diagnosing problems” (column 3, lines 10-12). The telemetry data may be provided by an electronic diagnosis performed using a map (*see* column 11, lines 39-41). However, the active journal is shared with other analysts because it is technical

and is meant to be interpreted by analysts and not end users. Thus, Sullivan teaches a technical active journal for use by technical analysts in debugging errors in programs (e.g., indicated by an error message on his/her screen after unsuccessfully launching a Microsoft Word application). This is not equivalent to a USER oriented application operator for “a user-defined help message ... comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, Sullivan is not concerned with and does not address a need for providing “providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem ... displaying the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log; and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database”. Sullivan does not contemplate such a user based system supporting user operation of application but rather focuses on technical analyst’s debugging needs. Because the system of Sullivan is for analysts, Sullivan fails to recognize the needs of an ordinary executable application user, including “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database” as recited in claim 28 of the present arrangement.

In the “Response to Arguments” section on page 22 of the Office Action, it is argued that “[t]he analyst can then send the information in the form of a message to a user to activate the process of fixing the problem ... Therefore, the Examiner interprets the journal entries as containing help information conveyed to the user”. Even if the analysts in Sullivan send help information to a user, this is wholly unlike the self-help system “enabling a **user** to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database” as in the present claimed arrangement. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “displaying the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log” as recited in claim 28. The Office Action cites Figure 18 in support of the assertion that Sullivan anticipates this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Figure 18 merely displays a “Message Center” panel of the system analyst’s desktop. Applicant

respectfully submits that a screen shot panel of a system analyst's desktop is completely unrelated to "the **user-defined help** message according to a creation time in the help log" as recited in claim 28. Therefore, Sullivan is directed towards a system analyst's "Message Center" and is completely unrelated to the USER-DEFINED help message that is displayed, according to a creating time in the help log.

The claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Column 11 and column 13 of Sullivan cited by the Office Action on page 20 do not show or suggest the features of the present claimed arrangement. Column 11 describes a diagnostic map that can be utilized by system analysts. Column 13 describes a "Content Browser" display panel. "The Content Browser is preferably web-based and allows the system analyst to search or browse content that might be related to or useful in resolving the incident. Typically, the support organization sets up this home page to include a list of categories and subcategories with links to other pages" (column 13, lines 45-50). Therefore, Sullivan describes links inside self-help templates and allowing system analysts to search or browse content related to resolving an incident. However, this is not equivalent to the present claimed recitation of a "providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem".

In the "Response to Arguments" section on page 23, it is argued that "Sullivan provides a mechanism that allows the analyst to send to the end user a link to information derived from the repository (See column 13, lines 55-67)". Applicant respectfully submits that the cited passage describes that an analyst may forward a link to an end user. However, this occurs only after the analysts views the Content Browser and searches or browses useful content related to a problem. Therefore, although the user may be provided a URL, this is forwarded from an analyst and is NOT "displaying the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log ... enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database" as recited in claim 28.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in claim 28, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the features as recited in claim 28 of the present arrangement. Additionally, as claims 29 and 30 are dependent on independent claim 28, these claims are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 28. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 28-30 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Sullivan provides no 35 U.S.C. 112 compliant enabling disclosure that anticipates the arrangement claimed in claims 1-30 unpatentable. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

VIII CONCLUSION

Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests “[a] system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application ... an interface processor for receiving: user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Additionally, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests “a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of said help message; and ... a user interface providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. As independent claims 12, 15, 20-24 and 28 contain similar features to those of independent claim 1, these claims are also not anticipated by Sullivan. Furthermore, as claims 2-11, 13 and 14 are dependent on claim 1; claims 16-19 are dependent on claim 15; claims 25-27 are dependent on claim 24 and claims 29 and 30 are dependent on claim 28, all these claims are also allowable over Sullivan.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-30 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Alexander J. Burke", is written over a horizontal line.

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

March 14, 2008

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, N.J. 08830
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030

APPENDIX I - APPEALED CLAIMS

1. (Previously Presented) A system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising:

an interface processor for receiving:

user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem,

a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of said help message;

and

an identifier for identifying a help information repository associated with said help message;

a user interface providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository; and

a data processor for storing said help message conveying help information in said help information repository in order of creation by using said creation time indicator.

2. (Previously Presented) The system according to claim 1, wherein

said display image includes a link representative item enabling a user to retrieve said additional document and enables a user to retrieve help message information from said help information repository sorted by creation time using a creation time indicator and

said interface processor comprises a search operation, said search operation allows a user to search help information repository.

3. (Previously Presented) The system according to claim 1, wherein

said data processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting said hyperlink in a help message and

said data processor automatically deletes said help message after expiration of a time period from a creation time.

4. (Original) A system according to claim 1, wherein

said creation time indicator includes a creation date indicator and said data processor stores said message conveying help information in said help information repository in order of creation by using said creation time and date indicator.

5. (Original) A system according to claim 1, wherein

said interface processor receives said help message in response to user entry of said data representing said help message using a help window generated in response to user selection of a help icon presented in a displayed user interface image employed by said executable application and

said help information repository comprises records of help messages associated with at least one of: (a) said displayed user interface image and (b) an image element in said displayed user interface image.

6. (Original) A system according to claim 3, wherein

individual displayed user interface images employed by said executable application are associated with corresponding individual information repositories comprising records of help messages concerning a corresponding displayed user interface image.

7. (Original) A system according to claim 1, wherein

said help information repository associated with said help message comprises at least one of: (a) a web page, (b) a journal, (c) a database, (d) a record and (e) a system, of help information and

said help information repository is accessible by users of said executable application.

8. (Original) A system according to claim 1, wherein

said creation time of said help message comprises at least one of: (a) a time associated with receipt of said help message by said interface processor in response to user data entry, (b) a time associated with incorporation of said help message in said help information repository, (c) a time associated with entry of said help message by a user, (d) a time associated with communication of said help message to said help information repository and (e) a time associated with receipt of said help message by said help information repository.

9. (Original) A system according to claim 1, wherein

said data processor stores said help message conveying help information in said help information repository together with at least one of: (a) an indicator identifying a displayed user interface image associated with said help message, said user interface image being employed by said executable application, (b) a repository section identifier, (c) a sequence number identifying a message sequence within a repository section, (d) a help message creation time or date indicator, (e) information identifying a user creating or updating said help message, (f) a time or date indicator indicating expiration of validity of said help message.

10. (Original) A system according to claim 7, wherein

said repository section identifier identifies that said help message is to be stored in a repository section comprising at least one of: (a) a repository section accessible to all users, (b) a repository section accessible to an administrator, (c) a repository section accessible to an organization operating said executable application and (d) a repository section accessible to an organization owning said executable application.

11. (Original) A system according to claim 7, wherein

said interface processor receives said at least one indicator (a) to (e).

12. (Previously Presented) A system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising:

an interface processor for receiving:

user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem;

a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of said help message;

an identifier for identifying a help information repository associated with said help message, and

a section indicator identifying a section of said help information repository associated with said help message and said interface processor initiates searching of said help information repository to identify help messages in response to user command;

a user interface providing a display image presenting identified help messages ranked according to creation time and including a particular help message and a user selectable link enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository; and

a data processor for storing said help message conveying help information in said help information repository in an order of creation using said creation time indicator.

13. (Original) A system according to claim 10, wherein

said data processor stores said message conveying help information in said section identified by said section indicator.

14. (Original) A system according to claim 11, wherein
said section comprises at least one of: (a) a section accessible to all users and (b) a
section accessible by particular user and concerning policies and procedures.

15. (Previously Presented) A system for providing help information
supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising:

a command processor for:

receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem
encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for
eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular
user interface display image employed by said at least one executable application and
associated with said help information request,

retrieving help information from a repository in response to said request; and

a display generator for initiating display of at least one image in response to said
request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time
order of creation and associated with said displayed user interface image employed by
said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document
associated with a particular help message from said help information repository.

16. (Previously Presented) A system according to claim 15, wherein

said display image includes a link representative item enabling a user to retrieve said additional document and enables a user to retrieve help message information from said help information repository sorted in time order of creation and

said command processor receives a request to access help information supporting user operation of multiple executable applications and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image of a particular executable application.

17. (Previously Presented) A system according to claim 15, wherein

said time order of creation of said message comprises an order based on at least one of: (a) a time associated with receipt of said message by said interface processor in response to user data entry, (b) a time associated with incorporation of said message in said repository, (c) a time associated with entry of said message by a user, (d) a time associated with communication of said message to said repository and (e) a time associated with receipt of said message by said repository.

18. (Previously Presented) A system according to claim 15, wherein

said command processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting said hyperlink in a help message and

said at least one image presents messages conveying help information in time order of creation with a most recently created message being presented first.

19. (Previously Presented) A system according to claim 15, wherein said at least one image includes instructions guiding a user in use of functions available in said image.

20. (Previously Presented) A system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising:

a display generator for initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of:

(a) add a message to a help information repository,

(b) access user manual information associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application,

(c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and

(d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository; and

a command processor for initiating access to said help information repository in response to user activation of said image element.

21. (Previously Presented) A method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities of:

receiving:

(a) user entered data representing a message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem,

(b) an indicator identifying a creation time of said message,

(c) an identifier for identifying a help information repository associated with said message;

providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository; and

storing said help message conveying help information in said help information repository in order of creation by using said indicator.

22. (Previously Presented) A method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities of:

receiving a request to access help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem and including an indicator identifying a particular user interface display image employed by said executable application and associated with said request;

retrieving help information from a repository in response to said request; and

initiating display of at least one image in response to said request, said at least one image including messages conveying help information in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface display image employed by said executable application and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository.

23. (Previously Presented) A method for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application, comprising the activities of:

initiating display of at least one help access image in response to user selection of a help icon associated with a user interface image employed by said executable application, said help access image including an image element enabling a user to at least one of:

(a) add a message to a help information repository,

(b) access user manual information associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application,

(c) read information derived from said help information repository including messages conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem in a time order of creation and associated with said user interface image employed by said executable application, and

(d) retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from a help information repository; and

initiating access to said help information repository in response to user activation of said image element.

24. (Previously Presented) A method, comprising the activities of:

in response to a first single action, presenting a help log comprised by a user-editable help application, the help log corresponding to an operation related to a computer application;

in response to a second single action, providing a user-defined help message to a database, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem;

rendering the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log; and

providing a display image including said help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database.

25. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 24, further comprising:

displaying a link representative item in said help message enabling a user to retrieve said additional document and enabling a user to retrieve help message information from said database sorted by creation time; and

providing a confirmation of a posting of the help message.

26. (Previously Presented) The method according to claim 24, further comprising:

automatically parsing a help message and creating a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting said hyperlink in a help message; and

providing a search function.

27. (Original) The method according to claim 24, further comprising:
providing a preview of the user-defined help message.

28. (Previously Presented) A method, comprising the activities of:

via a first single action, accessing a help log comprised by a user-editable help application, the help log corresponding to an operation related to a computer application;

via a second single action, providing a user-defined help message to the user-editable help application, the user-defined help message comprising information related to the operation and addressing a recorded problem encountered in using said computer application by providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem; and

displaying the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log; and

enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said database.

29. (Original) The method according to claim 28, wherein the help log comprises at least one of: organization information, employee information, policy information, and procedure information.

30. (Original) The method according to claim 28, wherein the user-defined help message comprises at least one of: organization information, employee information, policy information, and procedure information.

APPENDIX II - EVIDENCE

Applicant does not rely on any additional evidence other than the arguments submitted hereinabove.

APPENDIX III - RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Applicant respectfully submits that there are no proceedings related to this appeal in which any decisions were rendered.

APPENDIX IV - TABLE OF CASES

1. In re *Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216, USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983)
2. In re *Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)
3. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir),
cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989)

APPENDIX V - LIST OF REFERENCES

<u>U.S. Pat./Pub. No.</u>	<u>Issued Date</u>	<u>102(e) Date</u>	<u>Inventors</u>
6,999,990	Feb. 14, 2006		Sullivan et al.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Real Party in Interest	2
II. Related Appeals and Interferences	2
III. Status of Claims	2
IV. Status of Amendments	2
V. Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter	2-8
VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	8
VII. Argument	9-73
VIII. Conclusion	73-74

APPENDICES

I. Appealed Claims	75-89
II. Evidence	90
III. Related Proceedings	91
IV. Table of Cases	92
V. List of References	92